



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,510	04/30/2001	James A. Bisher JR.	A-6684	2086
5642 7590 04/15/2008 SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 5030 SUGARLOAF PARKWAY LAWRENCEVILLE, GA 30044				
			EXAMINER SHANG, ANNAN Q	
			ART UNIT 2623	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/15/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOmail@sciatl.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 09/845,510	Applicant(s) BISHER ET AL.
Examiner ANNAN Q. SHANG	Art Unit 2623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: None.
Claim(s) objected to: None.
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 4, 19-23, 26-39 and 41-44.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Annan Q Shang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2623

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: .With respect to the last office action, Applicant cancels some claims discusses the prior arts of record, the claimed invention and further argues that the prior arts of record do not teach the claim limitations (see page 9+ of Applicant's Remarks).

In response, Examiner disagrees. Examiner notes applicant's arguments, however, Dyer discloses a content delivery system that employs two kinds of multicast applications models: a broadcast-like multicast that sends data (VOD and other content) to a very large number of destinations and a narrowcast (multicast) that sends data to a fairly small group of subscribers. Dyer further discloses pointcast (unicast) that sends data to a subscriber. The server monitors subscribers request and controls the outputs of the multi-modulator to stream requested data accordingly to a subscriber (pointcast), small group of subscribers (narrowcast) and a large group of subscribers (multicast), using a modulator or combining subsets of modulators as needed (figs.1, 2, 6, col.4, lines 12-26 and line 31-59, col.6, line 37-col.7, line 29, line 48+, col.8, lines 27-67, col.9, lines 26-65, col.11, line 43-53 and col.16, lines 32-63). Dyer discloses (Remote Video Session Server 106 or 616, which includes a multi-modulator with input ports for receiving transport stream having a plurality of packets included and a plurality of PID streams (figs.1, 2, 6, col.4, line 31-59).

Information Server 102/RSM-106 'IS/RSM' 102/106, determines from a table whether a given packet of the plurality of packets is a multicast packet or a unicast packet, where if a multicast packet is designated for transmission from a plurality of modulators included in the multi-modulator and a unicast packet is designated for transmission from only one modulator of the plurality of modulators (col.4, lines 12-26 and line 31-59, col.6, line 37-col.7, line 29, line 48+ and col.8, lines 27-67); and associates a modulator identifier with each packet, where the modulator identifier identifies each modulator from which the packet is to be transmitted; processing each packet prior to transmission from one or more of the plurality of modulators; copying the determined multicast packets into modulators from which the multicast packet is to be transmitted (col.4, lines 12-26 and line 31-59, col.6, line 37-col.7, line 29, line 48+ and col.8, lines 27-67); The IS/RSM 102/106 further appends a data unit header to each packet and copied packet, and the data unit header associates the packet with the transmitting modulator; providing each packet and copied packet to a buffer in accordance with the data unit header; stripping the data unit header from each packet and copied packet from one the plurality of modulators (col.4, lines 12-26 and line 31-59, col.6, line 37-col.7, line 29, line 48+ and col.8, lines 27-67). Dyer further teaches, receiving user requests, recalling programs from memory (disk drive array, an off-line storage system such as an optical disk library, etc.), packetizing and pre-packetizing data and streams data, multicast, narrowcast or pointcast, based a determination of user requests (figs.1, 2, 6 and col.9, lines 26-65, col.11, line 43-53 and col.16, lines 32-63), but silent to explicitly teach copying the determined multicast packets depending upon how many of the plurality of modulators from which the multicast packet is to be transmitted. However, Du reference, discloses that when a multicast connection is required of a cell (packet), the packet is copied in accordance with the number of connections defined by the multicast connection and written into a respective buffer memory (col. 11, lines 19-22). Furthermore, the claimed step of "providing each modulator identified by the modulator identifier with a copy of the given packet, where each copy has a common output PID value associated therewith" is met inherently by the fact that the packet is a copy, therefore indicating that it would have the same PID and the fact that the Dyer reference teaches providing the packets to the modulators based on the routing table, which determines the modulator assigned to each individual modems. Hence the rejection is proper, meets all the claim limitations. The finality of the last office action is hereby maintained.